

### **REMARKS**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1-14 are cancelled in the present application. Claims 15-31 are new to the present application. Claims 15-31 are pending in the present application. Claims 15 and 31 are independent claims.

### **Specification Objections**

The title of the application is objected to because the Examiner does not consider it sufficiently descriptive. A new title has been selected for the application and is included in the amended specification.

### **Claim Objections**

Claim 14 is objected to because of phrases in parentheses within the claim. This claim has been cancelled and the specific objection to this claim is now moot.

Insofar as it pertains to the currently pending claims, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection.

### **Amendments to the Specification**

The substance of claims 1-14 is presented in a grammatically revised but substantively identical format as an amendment to the specification to preserve the disclosures contained in the now-cancelled claims. This amendment to the specification does not introduce any new material.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,565,887 to McCambridge et al. (hereafter "McCambridge"). These claims have been cancelled, rendering this rejection moot. To the extent that the rejection has applicability to the currently pending claims, Applicants argue as follows:

McCambridge teaches a method that "restricts movement of a cursor on a computer screen in response to movement signals." (Col. 1, lines 64-66). The specific method taught by McCambridge entails comparing the x and y components of a cursor movement and selecting either the x or the y component as the movement depending on which component is larger. (Col. 2, lines 1-5). The method uses a pre-defined weighting factor for subsequent x and y component comparisons so that only large, deliberate movement changes are captured. (Col. 2, lines 50-62). The weighting factor is only disclosed as being selected for use in the method. The weighting factor as disclosed in McCambridge is not modified or updated during the execution of the method.

Independent claims 15 and 31 pertain, inter alia, to "altering a shape of the established direction-specific leading-in area in response to continuous motion input." McCambridge does not teach or suggest the concept of leading-in areas, instead disclosing only absolute-value comparisons between movement components (Col. 5, lines 2-8) that have an associated weighting factor to prevent frequent, unwanted direction changes (Col. 5, lines 40-56). McCambridge does not teach or suggest "altering a shape of the established direction-specific leading-in area in response to continuous motion input" as required by independent claims 15 and 31.

At least in view of the above, Applicants submit that McCambridge has defects in its teaching and does not anticipate the invention claimed by Applicants. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection insofar as it pertains to the currently pending claims.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 9-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCambridge in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0048423 A1 by Rekimoto (hereafter "Rekimoto"). These claims have been cancelled, rendering this rejection moot. To the extent that the rejection has applicability to the currently pending claims, Applicants argue as follows:

With respect to independent claims 15 and 31, Rekimoto discloses a device and associated method for pointer movement whereby rotating a handheld computing device causes the cursor or the screen display of the device to "roll" in the direction of rotation (Para. 0007 and 0008). The disclosures of Rekimoto do not deal with leading-in areas or the dynamic adjustment thereof. Rekimoto only teaches pointer movement insofar as it pertains to rotating a handheld device and does not address "altering a shape of the established direction-specific leading-in area in response to continuous motion input" as required by claims 15 and 31.

At least in view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that Rekimoto does not remedy the defects in the teachings of McCambridge and that therefore Rekimoto and McCambridge do not establish, either alone or in combination (assuming the references may be combined, which Applicants do not admit) a prima facie obviousness of independent claims 15 and 31 as well as claims depending therefrom. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection insofar as it pertains to the currently pending claims.

Claim 14 stands rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCambridge in view of Rekimoto in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,333,247 to Gest et al. (hereafter "Gest"). This claim has been cancelled, rendering this rejection moot. To the extent that the rejection has applicability to the currently pending claims, Applicants argue as follows:

With respect to independent claims 15 and 31, Gest discloses "a system and method for scrolling information displayed to a user of a processing system." (Col. 1, lines 19-21). Gest teaches a virtual scroll button, where moving a cursor into an area of the scroll area disclosed by Gest activates a scrolling function associated with that area. (Col. 8, lines 1-14). Gest does not teach or suggest display object movement on a screen other than to indicate means of activating the disclosed scrolling method. (Col 8, lines 10-14). Gest does not address "altering a shape of the established direction-specific leading-in area in response to continuous motion input" as required by claims 15 and 31.

At least in view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that Gest does not remedy the defects in the teachings of McCambridge and Rekimoto and that therefore Gest, Rekimoto, and McCambridge do not establish, either alone or in combination (assuming the references may be combined, which Applicants do not admit) a prima facie obviousness of independent claims 15 and 31 as well as claims depending therefrom. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection insofar as it pertains to the currently pending claims.

#### Conclusion

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance. Thus, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the outstanding rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance in the present application.

However, should the Examiner believe that any outstanding matters remain in the present application, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' representative, Michael Cammarata (Reg. No. 39,491) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution .

In view of the above amendments, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: **OCT. 4, 2007**

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael R. Cammarata  
Registration No.: 39,491  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant